In the Matter of the Petition

of

LAMPERT COMMUNICATIONS, INC. :

AFFIDAVIT OF MAILING

State of New York County of Albany

and by depositing same enclosed in a postpaid properly addressed wrapper in a (post office or official depository) under the exclusive care and custody of the United States Postal Service within the State of New York.

Sworn to before me this

29th day of September , 1976.

anet back

Carmin Mottolice

In the Matter of the Petition

of

AFFIDAVIT OF MAILING

State of New York County of Albany

Carmen Mottolese

, being duly sworn, deposes and says that

she is an employee of the Department of Taxation and Finance, over 18 years of age, and that on the  $29 \, \text{th}$  day of September , 1976 , she served the within

Notice of Decision

by (certified) mail upon Martin Halpern & Jonah

Blumenfrucht, C.P.A. 's Representative of the petitioner in the within proceeding,

by enclosing a true copy thereof in a securely sealed postpaid wrapper addressed

as follows: Martin Halpern & Jonah Blumenfrucht, C.P.A.'s

c/o Laventhol & Horwath

919 Third Avenue

New York, New York 10022 and by depositing same enclosed in a postpaid properly addressed wrapper in a (post office or official depository) under the exclusive care and custody of the United States Postal Service within the State of New York.

That deponent further says that the said addressee is the (representative of the) petitioner herein and that the address set forth on said wrapper is the last known address of the (representative of the) petitioner.

Sworn to before me this

29th day of September , 1976.

and Mach

Carmen Mottolece

TA-3 (2/76)



# STATE OF NEW YORK DEPARTMENT OF TAXATION AND FINANCE

TAX APPEALS BUREAU

STATE CAMPUS ALBANY, N.Y. 12227 ADDRESS YOUR REPLY TO

September 29, 1976

TELEPHONE: (518) 457-3850

Lampert Communications, Inc. 770 Lexington Avenue New York, New York 10021

## Gentlemen:

Please take notice of the DECISION of the State Tax Commission enclosed herewith.

Please take further notice that pursuant to Section 1090 of the Tax Law, any proceeding in court to review an adverse decision must be commenced within 4 months from the date of this notice.

Inquiries concerning the computation of tax due or refund allowed in accordance with this decision or concerning any other matter relative hereto may be addressed to the undersigned. They will be referred to the proper party for reply.

rylly yours

Enc.

Supervising Tax Hearing Officer

cc: Petitioner's Representative:

Taxing Bureau's Representative:

STATE OF NEW YORK

STATE TAX COMMISSION

In the Matter of the Petition

of

LAMPERT COMMUNICATIONS, INC.

**DECISION** 

for Redetermination of a Deficiency or for Refund of Franchise Tax on Business Corporations under Article 9-A of the Tax Law for the Year 1974.

Petitioner, Lampert Communications, Inc., with offices at 770 Lexington Avenue, New York, New York 10021, has filed a petition for redetermination of a denial of its claim for refund of corporation franchise tax paid under Article 9-A of the Tax Law for the year 1974. (File No. 11676).

A formal hearing was held before Edward L. Johnson, Hearing Officer, at the offices of the State Tax Commission, Two World Trade Center, New York, New York, on July 14, 1976, at 1:15 P.M. Petitioner appeared by Martin Helpern and Jonah Blumenfrucht, CPA's. The Corporation Tax Bureau appeared by Peter Crotty, Esq., (Alexander Weiss, Esq. of counsel).

#### ISSUE

Whether the compensation paid employees who were not elected or appointed as officers of the corporation was properly includable in computing the third alternative corporate tax under the Tax Law, section 210, Subd. 1(a)(3).

### FINDINGS OF FACT

- 1. Petitioner, Lampert Communications, Inc., (hereinafter Lampert), timely filed its New York State Corporation Franchise Tax Report under Article 9-A of the Tax Law for the year 1974 and paid the computed tax of \$4,348.00.
- 2. On May 30, 1975, petitioner, Lampert, filed a claim for credit or refund of corporation tax paid, stating that in computing the tax due under the income-plus-compensation method, the petitioner had erroneously included salaries paid to certain individuals who were not actually officers. Recomputations were submitted, eliminating \$116,050.00 paid to four persons whom petitioner had included as vice-presidents. Petitioner, Lampert, requested a refund of \$3,133.00, the claimed tax overpayment.
- 3. On August 8, 1975, the Corporation Tax Bureau sent petitioner, Lampert, a notice of disallowance of its claim.
- 4. Petitioner, Lampert, filed a petition, dated September 17, 1975, for redetermination of a deficiency or for refund of tax.
- 5. The four "vice-presidents" whose compensation petitioner, Lampert, sought to exclude in its recomputation of the corporation tax for 1974, were account representatives. Petitioner, Lampert, was an advertising agency. These account representatives were compensated on a commission basis with drawing accounts. They were known in the industry as vice-presidents so as to enhance their prestige with potential customers. Neither the Board of Directors,

nor the executives of petitioner, Lampert, appointed or elected these "vice-presidents" as corporate officers. Their use of stationery and business cards with the title "vice-president" was open and notorious, and was a practice permitted and approved by petitioner, Lampert.

6. Petitioner, Lampert, designated the "vice-presidents" as officers in reporting the compensation to officers on Schedule E of the U.S. Corporation Income Tax Return, Form 1120, for the tax year 1974. Petitioner, Lampert, asserted that these individuals had no general duties or responsibilities within the company but were merely account representatives using a title which was standard in the advertising industry.

# CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

A. That an elected or appointed officer includes any officer, irrespective of title, who is charged with and performs any of the regular functions of any such officer. 20 NYCRR 3.20(c). A regular function of the vice-president of a business corporation is to hold himself out as a vice-president. Here, this holding out is not only approved by the corporation, but admittedly enhances its business expectancies. Persons held out by the corporation as officers in the conduct of business for the corporation may become de facto officers whether de jure or not. 19 Am. Jur. 2d - Corporation #1100. The compensation paid the "vice-presidents" by petitioner, Lampert, was properly includable in the computation of the corporation tax under sec. 210 subd. 1(a) (3) of the Tax Law.

B. That the petition of petitioner, Lampert Communications, Inc., is in all respects denied. The denial of petitioner, Lampert's claim for a refund of corporation tax paid for 1974 is sustained.

DATED: Albany, New York September 29, 1976 STATE TAX COMMISSION

PRESIDENT

COMMISSIONER

COMMISSIONER